(3)

CHOOK

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
(CHHATTISGARH)

WRIT PETITION NO. 3530 /2003

PETITIONER

H.P. Shukla, son of Shri DP Shukla, aged about 58 years, Assistant Food officer, Department of Food Corporation of India, Resident of Mukt Nagar, P.S. Kotwali, District Durg (C.G.)

P. R. No. 3335/03
Presented by Shri Faiz Hamid
dated 29.10.03

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. The State of Chhattisgarh through : Secretary, Department of Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection, D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralay, Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

RECEIVED-COPY
29-10-
Clerk to A. G. Bilaspur

2. The Director, Department of Food Civil Supplies and Consumer Protection, Anand Nagar, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

3. The Collector, District Durg (Chhattisgarh).

शपथ आयुक्त
एस.के. शुक्ला
बिलासपुर
29/10/03
बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

4. The Collector, District Kabeerdham, (Chhattisgarh).

5. T.C. Tiwari, Assistant Food Officer, Kabirdham (Chhattisgarh).

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS/CERTIORARI, ORDER/ORDERS, DIRECTION / DIRECTIONS PROHIBITION ETC.

(40)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 3530 सन् 2003

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	09.01.2004 Smt. Fouzia Mirza, counsel for the petitioner. Ms. Sharmila Singhai, Dy. Govt. Adv. for the State. Heard. By this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India the petitioner has challenged the order dated 16.07.2003 (Annexure P-1) by which the petitioner has been transferred from Durg to Kabirdham. The petitioner is working as Assistant Food Officer, Distt. Durg. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned transfer order (Annexure P-1) has not been passed on the administrative exigency but it has been passed in order to accommodate respondent No.5- T.C. Tiwari, Assistant Food Officer, Kabirdham, who was previously also working at Durg before his transfer from Durg to Kabirdham in the month of July 2002. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation and respondent may be directed to decide the representation of the petitioner to which learned State counsel has no objection. -2-	

[पीछे

(41)

XI-HC-22

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

आदेश पत्रक

मामला क्रमांक WP 3530/03 सन् 200

विरुद्ध

आदेश का दिनांक आदेश क्रमांक सहित	आदेश हस्ताक्षर सहित —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation raising all his grievances within a period of ten days from today to respondent no.2 and respondent no.2 in turn shall decide the representation of the petitioner within another period of thirty days in an objective manner considering all his grievances with a reasoned order. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.W.P. No. 3200/2003 & I.A. No.10,111/2003 also stands disposed of. Certified copy as per Rules **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Rashmi

[पीछे देखिये